Case:3:09-cv-03529-JSW Document 89 Filed 04/08/10 Page 11:0655 IORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP JAMI WINTZ MCKEON, State Bar No. 237923 ELIZABETH A. FROHLICH, State Bar No. 195454 One Market, Spear Street Tower		
San Francisco, CA 94105-1126 Tel: 415.442.1000		
Fax: 415.442.1001 jmckeon@morganlewis.com efrohlich@morganlewis.com		
Deutsche Bank Securities Inc.		
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION		
LOUISIANA PACIFIC CORPORATION,	Case No. CV09-03529-JSW	
Plaintiff,	Reassigned to the Honorable Jeffrey S. White – Courtroom 11	
VS.	Complaint filed: July 31, 2009	
MONEY MARKET 1 INSTITUTIONAL INVESTMENT DEALER: MERRILL	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER	
LYNCH & CO., INC.; MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH	GRANTING LEAVE TO EXCEED PAGE LIMITS ESTABLISHED BY THE COURT'S	
INCORPORATED; AND DEUTSCHE BANK SECURITIES INC.,	CIVIL STANDING ORDERS AND SETTING BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND HEARING DATE FOR MOTIONS TO	
Defendants.	DISMISS	
	JAMI WINTZ MCKEON, State Bar No. 237 ELIZABETH A. FROHLICH, State Bar No. One Market, Spear Street Tower San Francisco, CA 94105-1126 Tel: 415.442.1000 Fax: 415.442.1001 jmckeon@morganlewis.com efrohlich@morganlewis.com Attorneys for Defendant Deutsche Bank Securities Inc. UNITED STAT NORTHERN DIS SAN FRAN LOUISIANA PACIFIC CORPORATION, Plaintiff, vs. MONEY MARKET 1 INSTITUTIONAL INVESTMENT DEALER; MERRILL LYNCH & CO., INC.; MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH INCORPORATED; AND DEUTSCHE BANK SECURITIES INC.,	

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES

Case 3:09-cv-03529-JSW Document 89 Filed 04/07/10 Page 22 of f55

1	Plaintiff Louisiana Pacific Corporation ("Plaintiff") and Defendants Money Market 1	
2	Institutional Investment Dealer ("MM1") and Deutsche Bank Securities Inc. ("DBSI")	
3	(collectively, "Defendants"), by and through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate	
4	as follows:	
5	WHEREAS, Plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint ("FAC"), asserting 13 causes of	
6	action, on March 8, 2010;	
7	WHEREAS, the Court issued its order denying DBSI's motion to transfer venue pursuant	
8	to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) on March 22, 2010;	
9	WHEREAS, the parties previously stipulated and the Court ordered that if DBSI's motion	
10	to transfer was denied, the Defendants would have 30 days after such order was entered to answer	
11	or otherwise respond to Plaintiff's operative pleading, if any defendant filed a motion to dismiss,	
12	Plaintiff would serve its opposition within 45 days after service of any such motion to dismiss,	
13	and Defendants would have 30 days to serve any reply;	
14	WHEREAS, the FAC asserts federal securities fraud, California securities fraud, and	
15	common law fraud claims against Defendants and breach of fiduciary duty and negligent	
16	misrepresentation claims against MM1 in connection with auction-rate securities ("ARS") –	
17	financial instruments that pay interest at rates set at periodic auctions;	
18	WHEREAS, the FAC alleges over the course of 237 paragraphs and 79 pages that	
19	Defendants engaged in a comprehensive scheme to defraud Plaintiff in violation of Section 10(b)	
20	of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and Rule 10b-5, that Defendants violated Sections 25500,	
21	25501 and 25504.1 of the California Corporate Securities Law of 1968, that Defendants	
22	committed common law fraud and that MM1 made negligent misrepresentations and breached its	
23	fiduciary duties to Plaintiff;	
24	WHEREAS, the FAC contains allegations concerning 14 different securities purchased by	
25	Plaintiff and alleges that defendant DBSI's wrongful conduct involved eight different securities	
26	underwritten by it and that defendant MM1's wrongful conduct involved those same eight	
27	different securities plus an additional six different securities underwritten by the Merrill Lynch	
28	defendants;	

Casse 3:09-cv-03529-JSW Document 89 Filed 04/07/10 Page 330f f5

WHEREAS, the parties agree that the FAC's scope and complexity warrant a modest		
increase in the page limits imposed by this Court's Civil Standing Orders for Defendants'		
opening briefs and Plaintiff's opposition on Defendants' motion to dismiss, but that the page limit		
for Defendants' reply briefs shall remain 15 pages (exclusive of title pages, indices of cases, table		
of contents, exhibits, and summaries of argument); and		
WHEREAS, Plaintiff and MM1 agree to extend the deadline for MM1's filing of its		
motion to dismiss by two days from April 21, 2010 to April 23, 2010 to accommodate the		
calendar of counsel for MM1, and note that no prior extensions or changes have been made to		
MM1's deadline to respond to the FAC;		
IT IS THEREFORE STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between Plaintiff and		
Defendants, acting through their respective counsel, subject to this Court's approval, as follows:		
1. DBSI shall file its opening papers in support of its motions to dismiss on or before		
April 21, 2010, Plaintiff shall file its opposition papers on or before June 7, 2010, and DBSI shall		
file its reply papers on or before July 7, 2010;		
2. MM1 shall file its opening papers in support of its motions to dismiss on or before		
April 23, 2010, Plaintiff shall file its opposition papers on or before June 7, 2010, and MM1 shall		
file its reply papers on or before July 7, 2010		
3. The hearing date for Defendants' motions to dismiss shall be August 27, 2010 at		
9:00 a.m.		
4. Defendant DBSI's memorandum of law in support of its motion to dismiss shall		
not exceed 35 pages in length (exclusive of title pages, indices of cases, table of contents,		
exhibits, and summaries of argument);		
5. Defendant MM1's memorandum of law in support of its motion to dismiss shall		
not exceed 46 pages in length (exclusive of title pages, indices of cases, table of contents,		
exhibits, and summaries of argument);		
6. Plaintiff's memorandum of law in opposition to DBSI's motion to dismiss shall		
not exceed 35 pages (exclusive of title pages, indices of cases, table of contents, exhibits, and		
summaries of argument); and		

Casse 3:09-cv-03529-JSW Document 89 Filed 04/07/10 Page 440f f5

1	7. Plaintiff's memorandum of law in opposition to MM1's motion to dismiss shall 35		
2	not exceed $\cancel{40}$ pages (exclusive of title pages, indices of cases, table of contents, exhibits, and		
3	summaries of argument).		
4	Dated: April 7, 2010	KELLOGG, HUBER, HANSEN, TODD, EVANS & FIGEL, P.L.L.C.	
5		Mark C. Hansen David L. Schwarz	
6		Kevin J. Miller Andrew C. Shen	
7		Allulew C. Sileli	
8		Dec /c/ A v. Justice C. Cl. v.	
9		By /s/ Andrew C. Shen Andrew C. Shen	
10		Attorneys for Plaintiff	
11		Louisiana Pacific Corporation	
12	Dated: April 7, 2010	ARENT FOX LLP	
13		Robert C. O'Brien Steven E. Bledsoe	
14		Antoinette Waller	
15		D //A / ' // W/ 11	
16		By /s/ Antoinette Waller Antoinette Waller	
17		Attorneys for Defendant	
18		Money Market 1 Institutional Investment Dealer	
19	Dated: April 7, 2010	MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP	
20		Jami Wintz McKeon Elizabeth A. Frohlich	
21			
22		By _/s/ Elizabeth A. Frohlich	
23		Elizabeth A. Frohlich	
24		Attorneys for Defendant Deutsche Bank Securities Inc.	
25			
26			
27			
28			
	-		

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES

Case 3:09-cv-03529-JSW Document 89 Filed 04/07/10 Page 550 f5 PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: _April 8 _____, 2010 ed States District Judge